Joint Assessment & Curriculum Committee Task Group’s Guiding Principles

- Department review should be based on a shared desire for continuous improvement, not a “gotcha” process;
- Department review should be helpful and meaningful to departments;
- Department review should be do-able by departments;
- Department review should build on existing processes and strengths;
- Department review should be collaborative and peer-based; and
- Department review should help the University allocate resources and support and should inform University Strategic Planning and budgeting.

Department Review Purpose
The purpose of the Marylhurst Department Review process is to ensure that our academic programs are of high and/or continuing quality; to perpetuate a culture of continuous improvement; to support a culture of peer collaboration, feedback, and organizational learning; and to provide for planning that aligns with the University’s strategic planning and budgeting process. The intended outcome of the Program Review process is to provide analysis about our academic programs’ strengths, areas for improvement, and future opportunities in regard to four key areas:

1. **Student Learning**: Direct assessment of learning outcomes – assessing students’ work (individual, course, or program-level)
2. **Student Experience**: Indirect assessment of students’ experiences – surveys, focus groups, course evaluations, alumni feedback, etc.
3. **Instruction**: Evaluation of how instructors (individually / collectively) are doing (direct or indirect) – course evaluations, assessing student work, course observations, structured conversations, etc.
4. **Curriculum**: Analysis of relevance and currency of courses and/or whole program offerings – environmental scans, program comparisons, syllabi review, employer surveys, etc.

This ongoing self-study process is sustained by the Office of the Provost and supports departments in the continuous improvement of their academic programs, including but not limited to: regular review/revision of academic programs using student and employer survey data; evaluation of the department’s alignment with the University’s mission and vision; identification of strengths and needs in the area of faculty development; and the program’s sincere engagement in assessment of learning outcomes.

The Department Review process is intended to be both analytically self-reflective and data driven. Data collected for the department review process (indirect and direct) might also point to improvements that could be made in enrollment management, student services, the Liberal Arts Core, Library, and other areas outside any particular department’s jurisdiction.
Department Review Content

- Chapter 1: Overview of Department: Mission, History, Program Offerings, Etc.
- Chapter 2: Student Learning – Formative reflection on data of assessment of program learning outcomes.
  - Data sources include: Student essays, exams, or other assessment/learning activities.
- Chapter 3: Instructional Quality – Formative reflection on data of faculty, instructional quality, etc.
  - Data sources include: Course evaluation data, peer reviews,
- Chapter 4: Student Experience – Formative reflection on data of student satisfaction and engagement.
  - Data sources include: Course evaluation data, alumni surveys, etc.
- Chapter 5: Curriculum – Formative reflection on curricular quality and relevance.
  - Data sources include: External review; market scans; syllabi review; employer surveys; student learning assessment data; etc.
- Chapter 6: Summative Analytical Report

Though there is significant overlap in the 4 areas of departmental review, each Chapter and each year serve as a magnifying glass, in a sense, allowing all of us to focus in on one area at a time. Doing so also allows us to coordinate assessment efforts at an institutional level (e.g., running the Adult Learning Inventory survey).

Assessment and Department Review

Assessment of student learning of program outcomes within a department is a key component of the Department Review and should continue on a regular, annual basis – following our existing Program Assessment Cycle.

Proposed Department Review ANNUAL Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Focus of Annual Report and Critical Peer Review Conference</th>
<th>Annual Plan &amp; Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | 2010-11 | Preparation / Planning year for rolling out new cycle / process  
 Chapter 1: Overview – Mission, Offerings, Program Outcomes, Resources, Etc. | • Expand current “program assessment” work into annual Department Review plans to address all 4 areas based on priority needs and/or burning questions. (Currently happening, anyway.)  
 • Each year/chapter there is a focus for reporting / improvement (to be fed back into Univ. planning), but during the year the other 3 areas are also attended to |
| 2    | 2011-12 | Any revisions to Ch 1 +  
 Chapter 2: Student Learning | |
| 3    | 2012-13 | Any revisions to Ch 1 or 2 +  
 Chapter 3: Instructional Quality | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Chapter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/2013-14</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Student Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2014-15</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1, 2, 3, or 4</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2015-16</td>
<td>Any revisions to Chs 1 – 5</td>
<td>Chapter 6: Summative Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Chapter 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2016-17</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1</td>
<td>Chapter 2: Student Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2017-18</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1 or 2</td>
<td>Chapter 3: Instructional Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2018-19</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1, 2, or 3</td>
<td>Chapter 4: Student Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/2019-20</td>
<td>Any revisions to Ch 1, 2, 3, or 4</td>
<td>Chapter 5: Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/2020-21</td>
<td>Any revisions to Chs 1 – 5</td>
<td>Chapter 6: Summative Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Chapter 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caveat:**

Departments that have specialized accreditation self-studies and/or visits in a given year can opt to suspend or postpone their annual report that year (though they will need to address that area in Chapter 6).